

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11 and 12 have been amended, and claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 12 remain in the application.

In the Office action, independent claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Hamburger in view of Currie and applicant's admission. The Examiner has taken the position that it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to place a boss on the leg portion of Hamburger in order to facilitate attachment of a shaft. As currently amended, claims 1 and 12 include the limitation wherein the hosel leg portion is generally rectangular in cross section with a width and the boss is generally cylindrical with a diameter that is at least equal to the width of the hosel leg portion. The basis for this limitation is found in paragraph 0017 of the specification. In the Hamburger putter head, the hosel extension 14 has an elliptical (not rectangular) cross section and there is no cylindrical boss. The currently amended versions of claims 1 and 12 also include the limitation wherein hosel leg portion has a leading edge extending from a point adjacent the boss to another point adjacent the club head body with this leading edge having a predetermined forward slant angle of 1 to 6 degrees with respect to the body axis. The basis for this limitation is found in paragraphs 0018 and 0019 of the specification. In the Hamburger putter head, the hosel extension 14 is slanted forward much more than 6 degrees. Therefore, claims 1, 4, 6 and 12, as currently amended, define an invention which is not obvious over any combination of Hamburger and Currie.

Independent claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Hamburger in view of Currie, applicant's admission and Jackson. The Examiner has taken the position that it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to plastically deform the

hosel extension 14 of Hamburger as taught by Currie. As currently amended, claim 8 includes the limitation wherein the hosel leg portion is generally rectangular in cross section with a width and the boss is generally cylindrical with a diameter that is at least equal to the width of the hosel leg portion. In the Hamburger putter head, the hosel extension 14 has an elliptical (not rectangular) cross section and there is no cylindrical boss. The currently amended version of claim 8 also includes the limitation wherein the hosel leg portion has a leading edge extending from a point adjacent the boss to another point adjacent the club head body with this leading edge having a predetermined forward slant angle of 1 to 6 degrees with respect to the body axis. In the Hamburger putter head, the hosel extension 14 is slanted forward much more than 6 degrees. Therefore, claims 8 and 11, as currently amended, define an invention which is not obvious over any combination of Hamburger, Currie or Jackson.


Regarding original claims 2-4 and 7, the Examiner commented that applicant has not set forth any evidence as to why a forward slant angle of between 1 and 6 degrees is critical in order to attain the claimed invention. Applicant would like to point out to the Examiner that the forward slant angle must be relatively small because lie angle adjustments on putters are also relatively small, usually no more than 2 degrees upright or 2 degrees flat. If the forward slant angle is too large as in Hamburger, the hosel will not be concealed from the golfer's view when the lie angle is decreased (i.e. flattened) only 1 to 2 degrees. Therefore, a forward slant angle that is relatively small is critical to the claimed invention.

In view of the preceding remarks, applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 12.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

6-16-06


Darrell F. Marquette
Reg. No. 28,560